

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 20, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 11 are independent. In the Office Action dated May 20, 2008, Claims 1, 9, 11, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and Claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated May 20, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 9, 11, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0037261 ("*Meffert*"). Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "upon receiving a user indication to enable the write protect logic through conversion of a format of a text in a body of the message to a format protected against subsequent alterations, and send the message to the at least one recipient." Amended Claim 11 includes a similar recitation. Support for these

amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 18, line 19 to page 19 line 2.

Consistent with exemplary embodiments, if a user, in step 810 chooses to write protect a message, an e-mail system may determine whether the user has instructed the e-mail system to send the message, as shown in step 825. (See specification, page 18, lines 19-21.) If the e-mail system has been instructed to send the message, the system may write protect the message as shown in step 830. (See specification, page 18, lines 21-22.) If the user has not selected to send the e-mail, the e-mail system may allow the user to continue editing the message in step 805, waiting for the user to select both write protect and send. (See specification, page 18, line 25 to page 19, line 2.)

In contrast, *Meffert* at least does not anticipate the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Meffert* merely discloses that database services comprise several databases that are accessed on an as-needed basis by a control server or other components to maintain an automatic and seamless implementation of a public key infrastructure (PKI) based encryption. (See page 7, paragraph [0077].) In *Meffert*, instead of clicking on a traditional "send" button provided by LOTUS NOTES, a user clicks a specialized button, via an InstallScripts.exe module, thereby launching the PKI-base encryption services. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].) In *Meffert*, a local agent 130 saves the email message to the LOTUS NOTES database and launches a login procedure to control server 200. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].) In *Meffert*, a "sent" database in LOTUS NOTES is updated to indicate that an email has been sent. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].) In *Meffert*, control of content dissemination is affected using options labeled Message Forwarding and Message Viewing. (See page 9, paragraph

[0093].) Consequently in *Meffert*, i) a user transmits an encrypted e-mail and clicks a specialized button, ii) an encryption service is launched and the user enters authentication information, and iii) the user controls the dissemination of the e-mail by controlling the Message Forwarding and Message Viewing. Accordingly *Meffert* is completely silent regarding a write protect logic operable to write protect a message in response to receiving an instruction to: i) write protect; and ii) send the message to the at least one recipient.

Meffert does not anticipate the claimed subject matter because *Meffert* at least does not disclose “upon receiving a user indication to enable the write protect logic through conversion of a format of a text in a body of the message to a format protected against subsequent alterations, and send the message to the at least one recipient,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 11 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 11.

Dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 11, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-20.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Meffert* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0145057 A1 (“*Throop*”). Dependent Claims 2-8 and 10 are each

patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, “upon receiving a user indication to enable the write protect logic through conversion of a format of a text in a body of the message to a format protected against subsequent alterations, and send the message to the at least one recipient.” Dependent Claims 12-14 and 19-20 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that they include a similar recitation due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 11.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, if a user, in step 810 chooses to write protect a message, an e-mail system may determine whether the user has instructed the e-mail system to send the message, as shown in step 825. (See specification, page 18, lines 19-21.) If the e-mail system has been instructed to send the message, the system may write protect the message as shown in step 830. (See specification, page 18, lines 21-22.) If the user has not selected to send the e-mail, the e-mail system may allow the user to continue editing the message in step 805, waiting for the user to select both write protect and send. (See specification, page 18, line 25 to page 19, line 2.)

As established above, *Meffert* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Meffert* merely discloses that database services comprise several databases that are accessed on an as-needed basis by a control server or other components to maintain an automatic and seamless implementation of a public key infrastructure (PKI) based encryption. (See page 7, paragraph [0077].) In *Meffert*, instead of clicking on a traditional "send" button provided by LOTUS NOTES, a user clicks a specialized button, via an InstallScripts.exe module,

thereby launching the PKI-base encryption services. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].)

In *Meffert*, a local agent 130 saves the email message to the LOTUS NOTES database and launches a login procedure to control server 200. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].)

In *Meffert*, a "sent" database in LOTUS NOTES is updated to indicate that an email has been sent. (See page 7, paragraph [0083].) In *Meffert*, control of content dissemination is affected using options labeled Message Forwarding and Message Viewing. (See page 9, paragraph [0093].) Consequently in *Meffert*, i) a user transmits an encrypted e-mail and clicks a specialized button, ii) an encryption service is launched and the user enters authentication information, and iii) the user controls the dissemination of the e-mail by controlling the Message Forwarding and Message Viewing. Accordingly *Meffert* is completely silent regarding a write protect logic operable to write protect a message in response to receiving an instruction to: i) write protect; and ii) send the message to the at least one recipient.

Further, *Throop* does not overcome *Meffert's* deficiencies. For example, *Throop* merely discloses that in order to process and manage email, a process begins by receiving an email at an email server. (See page 3, paragraph [0028].) In *Throop*, e-mail enclosures or attachments, if any, may be evaluated for type. (See page 3, paragraph [0032].) Email content without attachments, according to *Throop*, is converted to a graphic image such as a TIFF file. (See page 3, paragraph [0032].) If one or more attachments in *Throop* are not in graphic form, these attachments are converted to graphic form. (See page 3, paragraph [0032].) Like *Meffert*, nowhere in *Throop* does it disclose a write protect logic operable to write protect a message in response to receiving an instruction to: i) write protect; and ii) send the message to the

at least one recipient. Rather *Throop* discloses that email content is converted to a graphic form after the email is received.

Combining *Meffert* with *Throop* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Meffert* and *Throop* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest “upon receiving a user indication to enable the write protect logic through conversion of a format of a text in a body of the message to a format protected against subsequent alterations, and send the message to the at least one recipient,” as included in dependent Claims 2-8 and 10. Dependent Claims 12-14 and 19-20 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, and 19-20 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, and 19-20.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the claimed subject matter that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims.

Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: September 16, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ak

